

Entropy bounds in two dimensions

S. Mignemi[†]

Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Cagliari
viale Merello 92, 09123 Cagliari, Italy
and
INFN, Sezione di Cagliari

ABSTRACT

We discuss entropy bounds for a class of two-dimensional gravity models. While the Bekenstein bound can be proved to hold in general for weakly gravitating matter, the analogous of the holographic bound is not universal, but depends on the specific model considered.

[†] e-mail: smignemi@unica.it

It was observed by Bekenstein [1], that the entropy S contained in a weakly gravitating system must satisfy the bound $S \leq 2\pi ER$, where R is the linear size and E the energy of the system. This bound can be deduced from the generalized second law of black hole thermodynamics by means of a gedanken experiment known as Geroch process, and is known to be satisfied by all reasonable weakly gravitating matter systems. In particular, it is saturated by the Schwarzschild black hole. The validity of the Bekenstein bound for any $D > 2$ was later proved by Bousso [2].

A different bound, which is believed to hold also for strongly gravitating systems is the holographic bound, $S \leq \frac{A}{4}$, where A is the area of a surface enclosing the system [3]. This bound is justified by the observation that $A/4$ is the maximum entropy that can be contained in a region, before the matter collapses to a black hole.

In this letter we discuss the possibility of extending these bounds to $D = 2$. This is motivated by the need of exploring the universality of the previous bounds on more general gravitational theories than general relativity. Two-dimensional gravity offers a possibility for this, since it gives rise to several different models with varied physical properties. Moreover, in 2D the holographic bound cannot be defined in terms of area, since in that case the horizon of a black hole reduces to a point. Also, in ref. [4], it was observed that, in contrast with higher dimensions, two-dimensional black holes in general do not satisfy the Bekenstein bound. This fact was explained making recourse to the invariance of some two-dimensional models under dilatations. We shall prove that in any case, if one restricts to weakly gravitating matter, the Bekenstein bound holds and is a universal property independent of the specific model. On the contrary, we show that a bound of holographic type does not hold in general, but is necessarily model dependent.

It is well known that gravity cannot be introduced in a unique way in two dimensions. This is due to the fact that the Einstein action is trivial in 2D, and therefore one is forced to introduce a scalar field η (dilaton) in order to write an action principle for two-dimensional gravity. This field admits an arbitrary potential, which gives rise to an infinity of different models [5].

In the following we shall consider for definiteness a special class of these models, with action

$$I = \int d^2x \sqrt{-g} e^{-2\phi} [R - 4k(\nabla\phi)^2 + \Lambda e^{-2h\phi}], \quad (1)$$

where k and h are two arbitrary parameters. In order to have well defined black hole solutions, we require that $k > -1$, $h > -(k+2)$. The action (1) is rather general and includes as special cases many of the best known models. For $h = 0$ it reduces to the models studied in [6], while for $k = 0$ gives rise to the models of [7]. The case $h = 0$, $k = 0$ is the JT model [8].

The field equations derived from (1) admit the solution

$$ds^2 = -V(x) dt^2 + V^{-1}(x) dx^2, \quad e^{-2\phi} = e^{-2\phi_0} |x|^{\frac{1}{1+k}}, \quad (2)$$

where

$$V(x) = \frac{(1+k)^2}{2+k+h} \left(\Lambda |x|^{\frac{2+2k+h}{1+k}} - m |x|^{\frac{k}{1+k}} \right), \quad (3)$$

and m is a parameter. For positive Λ and m , these solutions describe black holes with a horizon at

$$x_0 = \left(\frac{m}{\Lambda}\right)^{\frac{1+k}{2+k+h}}.$$

The constant $e^{-2\phi_0}$ is arbitrary and its inverse corresponds to the two-dimensional Newton constant. We shall set it to 1 without loss of generality. It is evident that varying the parameters h and k one can obtain a large variety of models with rather different physical properties.

The mass M , temperature T and entropy S of the black holes (2)-(3) can be defined as in [9], and are given by

$$M = \frac{1+k}{2+k+h} \frac{m}{2}, \quad T = \frac{1+k}{4\pi} (\Lambda m^{1+k+h})^{\frac{1}{2+k+h}}, \quad S = 2\pi \left(\frac{m}{\Lambda}\right)^{\frac{1}{2+k+h}}. \quad (4)$$

If one identifies the size of the black hole R with x_0 and its energy E with M , it results that

$$2\pi ER \propto m^{\frac{3+2k+h}{2+k+h}} \propto S^{3+2k+h},$$

and clearly one can always violate the Bekenstein bound.

This can be seen as a consequence of the unusual thermodynamical properties of 2D black holes. In fact, splitting a two-dimensional black hole into black holes of smaller mass can be entropically favoured [10,7]. This is evident from the expression (4) for the entropy, if $k+h > -1$.

For our considerations, it is also instructive to write the entropy as a function of the black hole length, as

$$S = 2\pi x_0^{\frac{1}{1+k}}. \quad (5)$$

If $k > 0$, the entropy of N black holes contained in a given portion of space of size R is greater than that of a single black hole of the same size by a factor $N^{\frac{k}{1+k}}$. Hence, by increasing the number N of black holes one can apparently store an arbitrary amount of entropy in a given region. This behaviour may be seen as a consequence of the repulsive nature of the potential (3) at short distances for positive k . It must be noted however that in this case the system of N black holes is unstable, since the black holes will tend to move away from each other. As we shall show, in order to obtain the correct entropy bounds, one must therefore take into account the interaction between the N black holes.

Although in 2D the Bekenstein bound is not valid for a collection of black holes, it still holds for weakly gravitating matter. This can be shown by slightly modifying the proof based on the Geroch process given in ref. [2], in such a way to avoid any reference to the black hole area. The proof relies on classical general relativity and the generalized second law and neglects quantum effect [11].

Consider a weakly gravitating system of total energy E and linear size R . Move the system towards a black hole of radius much greater than R , described by a metric in the Schwarzschild gauge (2), with arbitrary $V(x)$ having a simple zero at $x = x_0$. Lower slowly the system until it is just outside the horizon and finally drop it in.

The mass added to the black hole is given by the energy E of the system, redshifted according to the position of the center of mass at the drop-off point, i.e. at a distance R from the horizon. Near the horizon the metric can be approximated as

$$V(x) \approx \left. \frac{dV}{dx} \right|_{x=x_0} (x - x_0) = 4\pi T(x - x_0),$$

where we have used the standard definition of temperature $T = \frac{1}{4\pi} \left. \frac{dV}{dx} \right|_{x=x_0}$. Denoting $y = x - x_0$, the proper distance l from the horizon is given by

$$l = \int \frac{dy}{\sqrt{4\pi T y}} = 2\sqrt{\frac{y}{4\pi T}}.$$

It follows that the redshift factor is

$$\chi(l) \equiv \sqrt{V(l)} \approx 2\pi T l.$$

The mass added to the black hole is therefore

$$\delta M = E \chi(l) \Big|_R = 2\pi T R,$$

and the black hole entropy increases by

$$\delta S = \frac{dS}{dM} \delta M = \frac{\delta M}{T} = 2\pi E R,$$

where we have used the thermodynamical relation $T^{-1} = dS/dM$. By the generalized second law this increase must at least compensate for the lost matter entropy, and hence

$$S_{matt} \leq 2\pi E R.$$

This proof is valid in any dimensions $D \geq 2$ and is independent of the specific action or solution, being based uniquely on the definition of a horizon and of the thermodynamical quantities and the generalized second law.

This is an indication of the universality of the Bekenstein bound and may be a sign of its independence from other kind of entropy bounds such that the holographic bound, which in 2D cannot be formulated straightforwardly and is model-dependent.

Indeed, let us now try to define a two-dimensional entropy bound which is valid also for strongly gravitating systems, as black holes. Of course, a holographic bound cannot be defined as in higher dimensions, due to the lack of an area in 2D. However, in analogy to higher dimensions, one can attempt to define a bound as the minimum entropy necessary for the formation of a black hole in a region of size R . In fact, if the entropy of the matter contained in a given region exceeded that of a black hole of the same size, adding matter till the formation of a black hole would violate the generalized second law.

From (5), one gets therefore, for a single black hole,

$$S_{matt} \leq 2\pi R^{\frac{1}{1+k}}.$$

One may object that, as discussed above, for positive k it is possible to store N black holes in the same amount of space, which would therefore contain a larger amount of entropy. However, these black holes repel each other, and such configuration cannot be stable. Neglecting the backreaction, we may assume that a stable configuration can be approximated when the distance between the black holes minimizes the potential $V(x)$. For a black hole of mass m/N , V has a minimum at

$$x_m = \left(\frac{k}{2 + 2k + h} \frac{m}{N\Lambda} \right)^{\frac{1+k}{2+k+h}}.$$

Hence, a system of N black holes of mass m/N in equilibrium will have size $R \approx Nx_m$ and entropy

$$S \approx 2\pi \left(1 + \frac{2 + k + h}{k} \right)^{\frac{1}{2+k+h}} R^{\frac{1}{1+k}}.$$

It follows that also in this case one can introduce a bound $S_{\text{matt}} < 2\pi\alpha R^{\frac{1}{1+k}}$, for a given constant α .

The results of this letter seem to support the view that while the Bekenstein bound is inherent to the definition of black hole thermodynamics in any metric theory of gravity, the existence of a holographic bound depends also on the dynamics of the specific model of gravity. This is not in contrast with the holographic principle [3], since it is reasonable to assume that the boundary dynamics depends on the theory that governs the bulk.

References

- [1] J. Bekenstein, Phys. Rev. **D23**, 287 (1981).
- [2] R. Bousso, JHEP **0104**, 035 (2001).
- [3] G. 't Hooft, hep-th/9310026; L. Susskind, J. Math. Phys. **36**, 6377 (1995).
- [4] M. Cadoni, P. Carta and S. Mignemi, Nucl. Phys. **B632**, 383 (2002).
- [5] For a recent review, see D. Grumiller, W. Kummer and D.V. Vassilevich, Phys. Rep. **369**, 327 (2002).
- [6] J.P.L. Lemos and P.M. Sá, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 2997 (1994); M. Cadoni and S. Mignemi, Nucl. Phys. **B427**, 669 (1994).
- [7] S. Mignemi, Phys. Rev. **D50**, 4733 (1994); Ann. Phys. **245** 23 (1996).
- [8] C. Teitelboim, in *Quantum Theory of gravity*, S.M. Christensen, ed. (Adam Hilger, Bristol, 1984); R. Jackiw, *ibidem*.
- [9] V.P. Frolov, Phys. Rev. **D46**, 5383 (1992).
- [10] R.B. Mann and T.G. Steele, Class. Quantum Grav. **9**, 475 (1992); P.T. Landsberg and R.B. Mann, Class. Quantum Grav. **10**, 2373 (1993).
- [11] W.G. Unruh and R.M. Wald, Phys. Rev. **D25**, 942 (1982).